DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 842 FL 020 880

AUTHOR	Underwood, Karen; Brunner, Anita
TITLE	Evaluation of Programs for Limited English Proficient Students, Fiscal Year 1991 (School Year 1990-1991).
INSTITUTION	Idaho State Dept. of Education, Boise.
PUB DATE	[91]
NOTE	35p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Education; American Indians; Bilingual Education; *Compliance (Legal); Delivery Systems; *Educational Background; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Identification; Language Proficiency; Languages; *Limited English Speaking; Migrant Youth; Private Schools; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; Remedial Instruction; Second Language Instruction; Spanish Speaking; Staff Utilization; State Programs; State Surveys; *Student Characteristics; Teacher Education; Teachers; Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS	*Idaho

ABSTRACT

Highlights of a state survey of educational programs to assist limited-English-proficient (LEP) students in Idaho's elementary and secondary schools are reported. An introductory section describes the legislative background and history of the survey and the methods used to gather data on programs and students. These methods include questionnaires, site visits, and school district records. The first part of the report summarizes student and program data, including LEP enrollments as a proportion of overall enrollments, student distribution by home language, migrant student population, academic achievement levels, number of public school students receiving instructional services designed for LEP students, the instructional models and services used to help LEP students develop English language skills, and staffing for this population. The report's second part describes state activities providing technical assistance to the schools, including preservice and inservice teacher education and on-site legislative compliance reviews. It is concluded that intensive efforts to serve this population continue statewide, there is little consistency in the approaches used by districts to provide services, identification occurs more commonly in the lower grades, and 585 students needed but were not receiving services. Survey results from the schools are collated and appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED352842

IDAHO STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS FOR

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS

Fiscal Year 1991
(School Year 1990 - 1991)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J L Evans

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL 020 880

JERRY L. EVANS
STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

BOISE, IDAHO

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS FOR LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS
Fiscal Year 1991
(School Year 1990 - 1991)

Karen Underwood
Supervisor
Compensatory Education

Anita Brunner
Consultant
ESL/Bilingual Education

The observations included in this report are those of a private external evaluator with a professional background in evaluation and bilingual education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Part One: Summary of Data on LEP Students and Programs 3

Part Two: State Technical Assistance Activities 10

Part Three: Conclusions 12

Appendix A: LEA Program Application Data 14

Appendix B: Program Assessment Data 22

Appendix C: Summary of Data Required by Title VII 30

INTRODUCTION

This report is submitted by the Idaho State Department of Education in compliance with Part 548 of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations governing grants to State Educational Agency Programs under the Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Paragraph 548.10 of the regulations requires that the state "collect, aggregate, analyze, and publish data and information on the limited English proficient persons in the State and the educational services provided or available to those persons."

The Department has collected, aggregated, analyzed and published data on the State's limited English proficient (LEP) students since 1983. Part One of this report is a summary of the highlights of the information gained from the data collection. Details of the information required by Title VII are reported in Appendix C.

Paragraph 548.11 of the Bilingual Education Act allows the state educational agency to use Title VII funds to engage in additional activities, such as planning, developing, reviewing and evaluating educational programs for limited English proficient students, providing or coordinating technical assistance, and providing training to carry out programs such as those assisted by the Act. The other activities conducted by the department under its Title VII grant include:

1) Reviewing and evaluating limited English proficient programs.

2) Providing, coordinating, or supervising technical and other forms of non-financial assistance to school districts (LEAs), community organizations, and private elementary and secondary schools that serve LEP students.

3) Developing and administering procedures for the identification of LEP students and the assessment of their educational needs and competencies.

4) Providing staff development activities designed to improve services to LEP students.

5) Designing activities and services to build the capacity of the LEAs to meet the educational needs of LEP students.

Part Two of this report is a summary of the state's efforts toward accomplishing these activities.

The State sets the following requirements for all school districts:

1) Conduct a home language survey to determine if a language other than English is spoken at home.

2) Assess children from homes where a language other than English is spoken for English language proficiency.

3) Design and structure a program of instruction to meet the educational needs of identified LEP students.

4) Submit a formal project application for SDE approval which outlines a program to meet the educational needs of LEP students.

5) Measure and report the progress of LEP students.

6) Report to the State Department of Education the results of an LEA program evaluation.

7) Submit LEP data to the SDE as required by Public Law 100-297 and a U.S. District Court Consent Decree of 1983, Civil No. 79-1068.

Requirements 4, 5 and 6 provide the basis for gathering the information contained in the present report. The state of Idaho collects that information in three ways. First is through a document called an Education Plan for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. The document is in the form of a questionnaire and is sent to all school districts in the state in the fall. Districts that have any limited English proficient students enrolled complete the form and return it to the State Department of Education. Other districts submit a written statement to the effect that no LEP students are enrolled. In 1990, 70 districts completed and returned the questionnaire, as compared to 64 districts in 1989 and 54 districts in 1988. This trend may be attributable to a greater enrollment of LEP students in more districts or greater awareness of districts toward LEP students. Thirty-nine districts submitted written statements attesting that no LEP students were enrolled in 1990, as compared to 50 in 1989. The fact that six more districts submitted education plans, and eleven fewer certified no LEP enrollment, suggests that five districts did not submit their certification of no enrollment.

The second method of collecting information is a site visit by the Title VII Bilingual/ESL Consultant and the other staff of the Compensatory Education Bureau to verify first-hand the LEP enrollment data and obtain detailed information on the kinds of services provided by the district in terms of personnel, materials, and instructional strategies. In 1990-91, SEA staff visited 38 districts for program or compliance reviews. All districts visited were found to be in compliance with state and federal guidelines and provisions of the Consent Decree. In 1989-90, the staff had conducted formal on-site reviews of thirty districts, double the figure visited the previous year. State policy requires annual review of all districts with an LEP population, in accordance with the 1983 consent decree. The above-mentioned on-site reviews are one approach to meeting this requirement. Another approach is through the third method of data collection, which is a written Assessment of the Limited English Proficient Program, completed by districts that submitted a Plan in

the fall. This assessment also reports data on enrollment figures, assessment, parent involvement, and staff development. Previously, only districts that had submitted a fall application and were not visited by a State Department representative submitted this spring assessment.

The Assessment is an efficient way to meet the annual review requirement, given that time, budgetary and personnel constraints make it prohibitive to visit all districts that report LEP enrollment. Demographics have changed in Idaho since the time of the consent decree, when LEP students were concentrated in fewer districts. It is now common for even smaller, more remote districts to enroll at least a few LEP students.

Consequently 71 districts submitted the assessment by June, 1991. One district that returned the assessment had not submitted the fall Education Plan LEP students. However, that district had been reviewed on-site by SEA personnel. Thus the State has enjoyed a 100% cooperation rate on the part of the districts in collecting data on the educational condition of LEP students.

The information contained in this report is derived from the three sources described above. Part One represents the statewide totals of data provided by individual districts, with comments and interpretation. Detailed summaries of the data from data collection instruments are provided in the appendices, along with some additional commentary. Part Two describes the state's technical assistance and training activities. Part Three consists of conclusions drawn from Parts One and Parts Two.

PART ONE: SUMMARY OF DATA ON LEP STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS

STUDENT IDENTIFICATION

The September 29, 1989 school census had shown a statewide student population of **214,571** in the public schools. The 70 districts that identified LEP students in 1990 reported a total school population of 198,479. Thus some 92% of Idaho public school students are enrolled in districts that are impacted to a greater or lesser agree by language minority students. Among these students, the initial home language survey identified students from 40 non-English language groups. The number of students identified by non-English home language was 8,199, an increase of 2,719 (49.6%) over the number identified in 1989, which was 5,480. This increase probably reflects more systematic identification of home languages rather than a truly dramatic increase in students of non-English background.

The figure of 8,199 means that 3.8% of the state's students are not from English-speaking backgrounds or are from backgrounds with a significant impact of a non-English language. The previous year's data showed approximately 2.5% of the state's students in that category, up from less than 2% in 1988.

The largest home language group was Spanish, with 6,685, which is 81.5% of the total number of students from non-English backgrounds. The number of reported Spanish-background students increased by 1,198 over the previous year, an increase approximately equal to that between 1988 and 1989. However, the percentage of students with Spanish backgrounds dropped by 3.5% as a proportion of the entire non-English background population. The second largest group continued to be Native American languages, with 659, an increase of 491 over 1989. Students with Native American backgrounds also increased from 3% to 8% of the non-English background population. Again, it is not likely that many more Native Americans lived in Idaho in 1990 than in 1989. In fact, the increase nearly matched a decrease that had been reported from 1988 to 1989. This was likely due to one or two districts with significant Native American populations realizing that Native American students may be considered as coming from non-English speaking backgrounds even if the Native language is not actually spoken in the home. The third largest group was again Lao, with 143 reported, or 1.8%. Their actual numbers increased by nearly 90 from the previous year, but their proportion of the population remained about the same.

Further details of the numbers of students from different language groups are provided in Appendix A.

Home languages other than English are identified through a variety of methods. Seventy-one districts reported using observation and referral by school personnel; fifty-two reported that a question on home language background is routinely asked during enrollment; fifty-three utilized a home visit or parent conference; and twenty-eight utilized a written home survey. All but three took advantage of more than one method of identification.

Public school districts are required to assess the English proficiency of students with a home language other than English. The districts reported assessing 13,219 students, which is more than the number from non-English backgrounds. This discrepancy is due to the fact that several districts considered that all enrolled students had been assessed for English proficiency, whether they had non-English home language backgrounds or not. A total of 3,253, were identified as limited in English proficiency, an increase of 324 over the 2,929 who were identified as LEP in 1989. Thus 40% of the students with non-English backgrounds were determined to be LEP. Fifty-three percent of the potential pool were so identified in 1989.

Means of assessing English language proficiency was reported in the fall Education Plans, whether by an explicit English proficiency test or standardized achievement tests. Norm-

referenced tests were the most frequently named means of assessment, reported by 62 districts. The most frequently named standardized achievement test was the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. However, all but two districts reported using an English proficiency instrument in addition to the standardized measure. The most frequently named instrument was the Language Assessment Scales (LAS), used in 38 districts, an increase of six over the number that reported using it in 1989. The LAS, which is published by CTB McGraw-Hill, is designed to be a measure of oral English proficiency, testing subskills of sound discrimination and production, vocabulary, aural comprehension and oral production.

Detailed information on the variety of instruments used is provided in Appendix A.

Of the children identified as LEP, 2,494 (76.7%) qualified as migrants eligible for services under Chapter 1-M. The number of migrant LEP children increased by about 200 over the previous year, but their relative proportion of the LEP population remained virtually unchanged.

EDUCATIONAL CONDITION OF LEP STUDENTS

More detailed information on LEP students' educational condition came from the respondents to the program assessment, as follows. (This information is also found in Appendix B.)

The program assessment asked respondents to estimate the percentage of LEP students in the four grade ranges listed below who were below grade level in reading, mathematics, and writing, and who lacked listening and speaking skills in English. The following table shows the number of respondents who reported these percentages per grade range and content.

	Grade Range			
Content	K-3	4-6	7-8	9-12
Reading	58	57	51	52
Math	59	58	51	50
Writing	58	55	50	51
Listening and Speaking	56	55	50	51

The fact that fewer districts reported figures for LEP students in the higher grade ranges is reflective of the lower enrollment of LEP students in higher grades as noted above. There are three possible interpretations of this phenomenon. One is that students acquire English skills and cease to be LEP as they advance in school. A second is that the LEP students achieve grade level abilities. And a third interpretation is that many LEP students

have dropped out before they reach the higher grade levels, due in part to academic language demands.

The following table shows the median percentages reported for the number of LEP students determined to be below grade level during the 1989-90 school year in reading, math and writing and lacking listening and speaking skills in English. Median rather than mean percentages are reported because the percentages reported by the districts were based on differing numbers of students. The median value means that half the respondents reported a percentage greater than the value given in the table, and half reported a percentage lower than that value. A greater degree of accuracy could be attained by asking respondents to report actual numbers, and then converting those numbers to percentages in the statewide aggregation. This would, however, require a great deal more time and effort on the part of the respondents.

	Grade Range			
Content	K-3	4-6	7-8	9-12
Reading	72%	75%	75%	86%
Math	40%	46%	42%	28%
Writing	61%	67%	75%	75%
Listening and Speaking	61%	58%	67%	66%

These median values are very similar to those reported in the previous year with a few notable exceptions. In the 1990 report, the median percentage of LEP students grades 9-12 below grade level in math was 40. That figure dropped to 28 in the present report. The median percentage of LEP students below grade level in writing in grades 4-6 dropped from 82 to 67. The figures are consistent with trends that show LEP students less disadvantaged in math than in language skills.

The only peculiarity in the data is the suggestion that LEP students are less disadvantaged in writing than in reading.

INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES FOR LEP STUDENTS

The fall plans reported a total of 3,114 students receiving special LEP services, and 585 who needed but were not receiving them; the corresponding figures for 1989 were 2,576 and 416. This suggests that 84% of those students who were assessed as limited in English proficiency were being given special services. In cases where districts reported that students needing services were not receiving them, they were asked to explain why. Reasons included scheduling, lack of resources, and the perception that LEP students were performing satisfactorily without special assistance.

NOTE: The total number of students receiving services and needing but not receiving services exceeds by 441 the number identified as LEP. This discrepancy is probably due to the fact that some districts had not formally assessed and identified LEP students but were nonetheless providing special services. In some cases, the students served had been identified the previous year, and respondents construed the survey to be asking how many students had gone through the LEP assessment process in the fall of 1990.

Respondents to the fall Education Plan reported the numbers of LEP children by grade level who received services in the public schools. No data are reported for private schools because the fall surveys showed no LEP enrollment.

Grade	Public
K	447
1	561
2	364
3	232
4	225
5	189
6	212
7	197
8	190
9	152
10	144
11	133
12	68
TOTAL	3109

This chart shows the same trend for decreasing numbers of LEP students in higher grades that was seen in previous reports. However, except for the generally higher numbers served in all grade levels, the patterns have remained stable.

In the spring assessment, 71 districts reported 3,932 LEP students enrolled in the public schools, of whom 3,458 received special services. The increase in the number of LEP students identified over the fall report is largely due to the influx of migrant students.

Fifty-four LEP students were identified in private schools within the responding school districts in the spring assessment, which is a marked increase over the three reported one year previously. However, only nine LEP students were reported as being provided special service in the private schools.

English Language Instructional Models

Different methods are used by the districts to serve LEP children in order to develop their English language skills and academic and cognitive knowledge. These methods include different approaches to teaching English as a second language (ESL), delivery of content instruction, the role of the native language in instruction, the roles of teachers and aides, in-class and out-of-class settings, kinds of materials used, and utilization of peer interaction. Respondents to the fall Education Plan were asked to select the descriptions of approaches which matched their local practices.

Fifty-eight districts reported that the regular teacher provides English language development; 53 reported that it was provided by an instructional aide, 23 by an ESL teacher, and 20 reported "other". The "others" were variously described as tutors, Chapter One teachers, migrant aides, parent volunteers, and even one superintendent.

Districts were asked in what setting English language development was provided. Nearly equal numbers responded that it occurred in the regular classroom (58) and in individual or small group pull-out settings (59). Twenty answered that it occurred in ESL classrooms, and six "other".

Access to District Core Curriculum

The State Department of Education recognizes that educational services to LEP students must encompass more than English language development, although that is a critical and basic aspect of services. However, it is not reasonable to expect LEP students to first become fully proficient in English and then "catch up" with other students in academic knowledge and cognitive skills. Therefore, the Education Plan asks the districts to indicate what methods they are using to provide LEP students access to the core curriculum. They were asked to select among various options to describe how the access was provided. Following are the numbers of districts that reported using each method.

Six reported that no special provisions were made. Of the rest, 62 reported "modified mainstream", through a variety of means, most commonly through peer tutoring or cooperative learning, adaptation of regular materials, and simplified teacher speech. Thirty-nine reported content instruction in students' first language, usually with an instructional assistant in a pull-out situation. Forty-nine districts reported pull-out content tutoring, and eleven utilized after-hours content tutoring.

Following is a summary of responses for approaches to providing access to the core curriculum:

Method	Number
No special provisions	6
Modified Mainstream	62
ESL Resource teacher	30
Simplified teacher speech	41
ESL in content area	37
Adapt regular materials	56
Supplemental native language materials	22
In-class native language support	29
Peer tutoring/cooperative learning	61
Content instruction in first language	39
Bilingual certified teacher	17
Instructional assistant	35
Regular classroom	26
Resource room	14
Pull-out	32
Pull-out content tutoring	49
After-hours content tutoring	11

Staffing

The Education Plan also indicated how many district staff members in various categories were specifically assigned per job description to serve LEP children.

Position	Total Number
Teachers	
Elementary	76
Middle School	13
Junior High School	32
High School	49
ESL/Bilingual Resource Teacher	16
Aides	
Elementary	123
Middle/Junior High	53
High School	31
Counselors	46
Psychologists	10
Other	24
TOTAL	473

The figure of 473 is a substantial increase over the 290 staff positions reported in 1989. However, it is clear that fewer than 290 individuals served LEP students per job description. Some respondents indicated that, for example, the same individual might work as an aide at both the elementary and high school levels. Such an individual would have been counted twice. It is worth investigating why the number of staff assigned "per job description" should have climbed so dramatically. In some cases, respondents made it clear that it was any teacher's responsibility to teach every student, LEP or not. In such cases, the "per job description" stipulation was not adhered to.

PART TWO: STATE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES

The State Department of Education employs an ESL/Bilingual Education consultant funded partially under the Title VII grant, who is responsible for monitoring the districts' programs for LEP students and for providing technical assistance them. The purpose of this technical assistance is to build the capacity of the state and the districts to meet the educational needs of limited English proficient persons.

The technical assistance efforts in 1990-91 were primarily in two categories:

1. Sponsoring a series of workshops and classes for college credit throughout the state on topics concerned with the identification and instruction of LEP students.

2. Conducting site reviews of districts to monitor compliance with state requirement for the education of LEP students.

Workshops and Classes

The State Department of Education ESL/Bilingual unit took an active role in 1990-91 as in previous years to bring training and staff development opportunities to school personnel involved in the education of limited English-proficient persons. The State arranged for consultants to visit Idaho and coordinated the provision of college credit for participation in several of the training events.

The State ESL/Bilingual office arranged a three-part series, Curriculum and Instructional Strategies for Multicultural Classrooms, conducted by Linda Gonzalez and Dan Watson, from California, widely known for their work in sheltered mainstream approaches. College credit was awarded for participants who attended all three sessions. The series was offered in Boise, Twin Falls and Idaho Falls. Thirty-six persons attended in Boise, 56 in Idaho Falls, and 48 in Twin Falls.

College credit was arranged by the State for participants at a "High Intensity Spanish Training" at Murtaugh. The purpose of the training was to provide basic Spanish communication skills to school personnel to facilitate interaction with their LEP students. The training was conducted by a staff person from the regional Desegregation Assistance Center.

Credit was also arranged for "Spanish in the Workplace", conducted at Eastern Idaho Technical College for local community members. A local Spanish teacher conducted the training.

The State also arranged credit for a "Mainstreaming Strategies" series at Bruneau-Grand View. The series consisted of sessions on ESL in content areas, cooperative learning, and metacognitive strategies. Approximately 35 school staff participated. The trainings were conducted by staff from the regional Title VII Multifunctional Resource Center and the Desegregation Assistance Center.

An ESL In-service was conducted in Emmett in November 1990, arranged by the State office and conducted by a representative of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. The in-service dealt with language acquisition and mainstreaming. It was attended by approximately 40 elementary and middle school staff.

The State sponsored a Title VII proposal development workshop in September, 1990 to assist districts in writing proposals for Title VII funding. Ten persons attended, representing nine districts. Two districts were subsequently funded for the 1991-92 school year. In conjunction with the workshop, staff from the Interface Title VII MRC and Desegregation Assistance Center provided information on bilingual program design.

MRC staff conducted a district-wide pre-service on mainstreaming in Buhl in September, 1990 with a follow-up in November on cooperative learning. Seven district staff persons attended both sessions and thus were able to gain college credit, arranged by the State Department.

A member of the Title VII MRC staff conducted sessions on Developing Appropriate Practices for Young Language Minority Students, in Twin Falls, attended by 33 persons; Boise, attended by 56; and Idaho Falls, attended by 57.

The State Bilingual/ESL Office worked with Chapter I, Chapter I-Migrant, and Special Education on the Collaborative School Project, a pilot effort for nine sites to seek ways to mainstream low-achieving students without reliance on separated instructional settings. Strategies included teaming, tutoring, counseling models. Personnel from participating districts attended a series of nine trainings from October 1990 to June 1991.

Site Reviews

The State Bilingual/ESL Consultant, in a coordinated effort with other members of the staff of the Compensatory Education Bureau, conducted site reviews to ensure that the districts were in compliance with state guidelines, and to offer recommendations and observations regarding the kinds and quality of services offered to LEP students. (As stated in the introduction to this report, State policy requires annual review of all districts with an LEP population. At present, the questionnaire detailed in Appendix B substitutes to a degree for on-site reviews, given the staff, time and budgetary constraints that make visits to all districts impossible.)

In 1990-91, State Department of Education staff conducted 38 on-site compliance and program reviews, eight more than the previous year. The reviewers commended districts for efforts at staff development, providing native language materials, and content area support.

At only a few of the districts visited were compliance issues discovered, and no district was found to be actually out of compliance. One district had no plan on file to identify and serve LEP students; one had no written policy; one had not made provision for access to the core curriculum nor systematic English language development; and one lacked guidelines for mainstreaming and appropriate grading practices.

When the reviewers offered recommendations, they were for hiring of staff, more teacher involvement in assessment, more guidelines for teachers in adapting assignments and grading practices, and awarding English credit for ESL classes at the high school level. In general, the recommendations encouraged more participation of mainstream teachers in educating LEP students, and thus more access for LEP students to mainstream instruction.

PART THREE: CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this report show a continuing intensive effort statewide, under leadership of the State Department of Education, to identify and provide educational services to students whose home or native language is other than English. One sign of this is the greater response of districts to both the fall Education Plan and the spring Program Assessment. Another sign is the greatly increased number of students identified with non-English language backgrounds and of LEP students. This indicates greater awareness of the ethnic and linguistic diversity of Idaho.

LEP students continue to perform below grade expectations, according to the perceptions of the school personnel who submitted the annual program assessment. However, almost by definition, a student limited in English proficiency could not perform at grade level, particularly when standardized tests are used as a criterion. It would be desirable to look for additional indicators of educational success for LEP students, including less retention in grade, lower drop-out rates, and evidence of achievement in the core curriculum by non-traditional measures. (These standards would also be measures of the success of the schools, not just the LEP students, particularly regarding changes in practices in grade retention.)

There is little uniformity among the districts in their approaches to identifying LEP students; methods include language proficiency testing, interpretation of standardized test scores, informal testing, and observation and referral. Even within districts, there is evidence that identification and assessment of limited English proficiency are not necessarily guided by consistently applied criteria. This is particularly evident when observation and judgment are the cited bases of identification and assessment.

The trend in 1990-91 continued for most LEP students to be identified in the lower grades, concentrated in kindergarten and first and second grade. The fact that identified LEP children are concentrated in the lower grades suggests that determination of English proficiency is based on interpersonal communicative language skills, which do develop rapidly, especially among young children. However, the data on the educational condition of LEP students offer evidence that more districts are aware that lack of such academic skills as reading and school-learned vocabulary also are part of English proficiency. Unlike previous years, the statewide data showed that generally, more LEP students were identified as below grade in reading than lacking in oral communication skills.

The State Department of Education, especially in the person of the Bilingual/ESL Consultant, has continued to promote the principle that responsibility for the education of LEP children lies within the classroom, not in pull-out or categorical programs, although these may have a legitimate supplemental role to play. The Consultant continued to make available trainings in approaches to mainstreaming in support of this principle.

The finding that 585 LEP students in fall 1990 needed but were not receiving services requires some consideration. Districts who fail to provide a language development program are out of compliance and may risk losing all federal funds. However, it is possible that some respondents construed "special LEP services" to mean a pull-out program or separate classroom. In some cases, it is possible that LEP students' needs are being met, as suggested above, through modified mainstream instruction, in which case these students are in fact receiving special services. Districts who reported LEP students needing but not receiving services will be reviewed by the State Department of Education to determine whether compliance issues are involved.

LEA DATA FROM EDUCATION PLAN FOR LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) STUDENTS

The data in this section are compiled from the responses of 64 districts that completed and returned the Education Plan for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students in the fall of 1989.

I. General Information

Total numbers of districts that reported having a written policy regarding the education of students with limited English proficiency.

Yes	45
No	27

II. Student Data

Total enrollments of public and private schools reported by districts that submitted LEP Education Plans.

Public	198,479
Private	5,189

Methods reported to be used by districts to identify students with a home language other than English.

Routinely asked as part of enrollment	52
Observation and referral by school personnel	71
Written home survey	28
Home visit or parent conference	53
Other	5

Respondents reported the number of students who were from language backgrounds other than English. The statewide totals per language group follow:

Non-English Language Backgrounds Identified

Language	Number
Basque	135
Cambodian	25
Chinese	73
Czechoslovakian	9
Farsi (Persian)	10
Filipino	24
German	35
Japanese	42
Korean	37
Laotian	143
Native American	659
Polish	38
Portuguese	75
Romanian	40
Spanish	6685
Thai	13
Vietnamese	55
Other	101
TOTAL	8199

The language groups above were specifically listed on the questionnaire form. Inspection of the "Other" category showed that 23 other language groups were represented. The most numerous were Russian (31) and Hebrew (10). All other groups contained fewer than 10.

Districts are required to assess the English proficiency of students who may be LEP. Respondents were presented a list of English proficiency tests and a list of standardized achievement tests and asked to indicate which were used to comply with the requirement to assess English proficiency.

English Proficiency Test	Number
Pre-LAS (Language Assessment Scales)	12
Language Assessment Scales	38
Dos Amigos	5
Idea Proficiency Test	13
Other	19

Not all who checked "Other" specified an instrument. Instruments listed included the Brigance (3), "teacher-made" (2), the TOLD (1), TACL (1), the Moreno (1), and "language sample" (1).

Standardized Achievement Test	Number
Iowa Test of Basic Skills	53
Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills	5
California Achievement Test	3
Other	25

Other standardized achievement tests listed included the Metropolitan (3), the SRA (2), the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (2), Stanford Achievement Test (2), and the Wide-Range Achievement Test, Zip, Monroe, Woodcock Reading, Woodcock-Johnson, Brigance and "teacher-made", all with one.

Respondents reported the number of students by grade level who were assessed for English language proficiency:

Grade	Number Assessed
K	1158
1	1376
2	1261
3	1105
4	1073
5	1082
6	1041
7	1020
8	945
9	900
10	872
11	782
12	619
TOTAL	13219

These figures are approximately double the numbers reported the previous year. As mentioned in Part One of this report, these figures certainly do not represent an actual language assessment of such large numbers. A few districts apparently reported their total grade-by-grade enrollments and considered all students to have been assessed for English proficiency. These districts did not seem to understand that the point of the question was that in cases where there was probable cause to believe a given student might be limited in English proficiency, in particular a home language other than English,

that student should be explicitly assessed through specified procedures and on the basis of established criteria.

The total numbers of students in public and private schools who were assessed and identified as LEP were:

Public	3253
Private	5
TOTAL	3258

III. Information on Instructional Services for LEP Students

Respondents reported the numbers of LEP children by grade level who received services in public schools within their districts.

The fall survey did not reveal any LEP students served in private schools.

Grade	Public
K	447
1	561
2	364
3	232
4	225
5	189
6	212
7	197
8	190
9	152
10	144
11	133
12	68
TOTAL	3114

Districts with LEP students are required to provide English language development. The fall survey provided lists of persons who might provide that service and settings in which it might occur and asked respondents to indicate which described their situation.

Following are the totals that indicated each:

Who Provides	Number
Regular Teacher	58
ESL Teacher	23
Instructional Aide	53
Other	20

Setting	
Regular classroom	58
ESL classroom	20
Individual/small group pull-out	59
Other	6

The number of LEP students reported as needing but not receiving ESL, bilingual or language development services was 585.

The following methods were reported as being used to provide access to the district core curriculum.

Method	Number
No special provisions	6
Modified Mainstream	62
ESL Resource teacher	30
Simplified teacher speech	41
ESL in content area	37
Adapt regular materials	56
Supplemental native language materials	22
In-class native language support	29
Peer tutoring/cooperative learning	61
Content instruction in first language	39
Bilingual certified teacher	17
Instructional assistant	35
Regular classroom	26
Resource room	14
Pull-out	32
Pull-out content tutoring	49
After-hours content tutoring	11

Number of identified LEP students who qualified for services under Chapter One-Migrant: **2494**

Number of identified LEP students who had Individual Education Plans for special education: **249**

Concerns are sometimes raised that LEP students may be placed in special education simply because their language skills do not allow them to do well on screening tests. However, the figure of 249 does not suggest that LEP students are over-represented in special education. In fact, they may be slightly under-represented.

The numbers of persons in listed positions who are specifically assigned per job description to serve LEP students were reported:

Assigned Per Job Description to Serve LEP Students

Position	Total Number
Teachers	
Elementary	76
Middle School	13
Junior High School	32
High School	49
ESL/Bilingual Resource Teacher	16
Aides	
Elementary	123
Middle/Junior High	53
High School	31
Counselors	46
Psychologists	10
Other	24
TOTAL	473

Total number of schools in responding districts: **428**

Number of schools at which staff are assigned per job description to provide services for LEP students: **209**

Funding Sources Utilized to Serve LEP Students:

Source	No. of Districts Utilizing
Regular district funds	62
Title VII	1
Chapter One	40
Chapter One-Migrant	41
Chapter Two	14
Head Start	2
Other	3

Districts were asked who is responsible for monitoring the progress of LEP students in language development, basic skills or content instruction. Responses were:

Director of Educational Program for LEP Students	33
Teacher	51
Counselor	9
Other	28

The Education Plan asks whether criteria are specified to identify students who no longer need special attention in the area of ESL or bilingual education. Fifty-seven districts responded in the affirmative, and thirteen negative. Criteria listed by the districts were nearly evenly divided among the three methods from which they were to choose:

Criteria	Number
Standardized test scores	46
Grades	48
Teacher judgement	57
Other	18

The State considers parent involvement in their children's education to be important, and therefore asks whether native language translation is provided to parents in each of four means of home-school contact. Following are the numbers of respondents who replied yes or no to each:

	Yes	No
Parent-teacher conferences	61	11
Written notes	57	14
Flyers, newsletters	38	30
Parent meetings	57	12

IV. Staff Development

The ability of districts to meet the special needs of limited English-proficient students depends on staff development. Therefore, the State asked the following questions. The numbers who responded yes or no to each are given.

	Yes	No
Does the district pre-service and/or in-service address issues in the education of limited English proficient children?	49	23
Does the district provide workshops, in-services or course work for staff who are designated to serve LEP children?	62	11
Does the district conduct needs assessments for the staff development of persons assigned to serve LEP children?	48	23
Does the district as a matter of policy hire staff to work with LEP children based on relevant credentials or training?	51	19

LEP PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Beginning with the 1989-90 school year, all districts that had not certified no LEP enrollment were required to submit an Assessment of the Limited English Proficient Program. This requirement was imposed because any district that enrolls LEP students must provide English language development and access to the district curriculum. Thus, in essence, all such districts should have a program, whether formalized or not, which can be assessed. The following data summarize the information provided by the 71 districts that were required to do so.

I. Student Data

The 71 districts reported a total public school enrollment of 199,669 and a total private school enrollment of 4,252. They reported 3,932 LEP students enrolled in the public schools and 54 in the private schools.

The districts reported the numbers of LEP students served per grade level in both public and private schools. Those numbers were aggregated into the following statewide totals.

Grade	Public	Private
K	506	1
1	641	1
2	429	0
3	312	1
4	276	1
5	264	1
6	253	0
7	241	1
8	211	0
9	166	0
10	137	2
11	120	1
12	64	1
TOTAL	3620	10

II. Student Assessment

The program assessment asked respondents to estimate the percentage of LEP students in four grade ranges who were below grade level in reading, mathematics, and writing, and who lacked listening and speaking skills in English.

The following table shows the number of respondents who reported percentages below grade level per grade range and content.

	Grade Range			
Content	K-3	4-6	7-8	9-12
Reading	58	57	51	52
Math	59	58	51	50
Writing	58	55	50	51
Listening and Speaking	56	55	50	51

The following table shows the median percentages reported for the number of LEP students determined to be below grade level during the 1990-91 school year in reading, math and writing and lacking listening and speaking skills in English.

	Grade Range			
Content	K-3	4-6	7-8	9-12
Reading	72%	75%	75%	86%
Math	40%	46%	42%	28%
Writing	61%	67%	75%	75%
Listening and Speaking	61%	58%	67%	66%

Median rather than mean percentages are reported because the percentages reported by the districts were based on differing numbers of students. The median value means that half the respondents reported a percentage greater than the value given in the table, and half reported a percentage lower than that value.

This table suggests that LEP students have the least difficulty with mathematics, which is popularly perceived, rightly or wrongly, as requiring less language ability. Moreover, computational skills learned in the native language are readily transferable to similar tasks posed in English. The data also suggest that LEP students have less difficulty writing than reading English, which is counter-intuitive.

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether standardized tests (ST), informal assessment (IA), or teacher observation (TO) were used to determine the percentages of LEP students below grade level in the three skills or who lacked English listening and speaking skills. The numbers who identified each method for each skill area are shown below.

	Method		
Skill	ST	IA	TO
Reading	44	57	53
Math	42	54	52
Writing	32	54	52
Listening and Speaking	34	54	62

Districts were asked to list any other academic or social needs their LEP students had. Following is a list of responses:

- U.S. History and Government
- Economics
- Comprehension
- Life Skills
- Friends
- Time to acquire whole language skills
- Adapt to American culture
- Bring students to functional skills level
- Familiarize with American society and culture
- Help students learn about and maintain their own culture
- Lack of basic skills
- Vocabulary for academic success in higher grades
- Language arts
- Gaining acceptance
- Desire to stay in school
- Extra-curricular activities
- Jobs and job training
- Guidance counseling for older students
- Health care
- Free or reduced school lunches
- Personal hygiene
- Continued integration with other students in classrooms and extra-curricular activities
- Poor work habits
- Expectations by classroom teachers that LEP students should meet the same standards as non-LEP students
- Inadequate housing

- Need translator when dealing with public health officials
- Study skills
- Community experiences
- Social skills
- Dental, vision services
- Learning to accept school rules and following them

Many of these responses reflect students' academic needs and their needs for cultural pride, acceptance, and access to levels Program Assessment Data, Continued

of housing and health care that many others take for granted. Some of the responses might be construed to show some insensitivity of the part of the respondents. For example, the observation that LEP students need "personal hygiene" might indicate a degree of prejudice, or it could be related to access to adequate housing and health care. The wording of the response carries connotations of "those dirty kids". Similarly, the respondent who said LEP students need to learn to "accept school rules and follow them" seems to ascribe an obstreperous quality to the LEP students, who may just not understand instructions given in English or be unfamiliar with school expectations.

III. Parental Involvement

The assessment asks how parents of LEP students in the district are kept informed of LEP activities. A list of four options was presented, and respondents checked which were used in their districts. They also indicated whether or not documentation was kept of these activities.

Method	Number	Documentation Kept?	
		Yes	No
Parent Meetings	42	30	12
Parent/Teacher Conferences	66	48	16
Written Notices	54	44	9
Other	27		

Twenty-seven districts reported using "Other", and descriptions included direct contact, such as an outreach worker or home-school liaison, and telephone calls.

Program Assessment Data, Continued

IV. Instructional Services Profile

Respondents were presented a list of six English language instructional models and asked to check which were employed in their LEP programs.

Model	Number
Modified regular classroom	53
Peer tutoring	49
Teacher pullout	37
Summer school	34
Aide/tutor pullout	59
Other	9

Aide pullout appeared to be the most commonly used model, followed by "modified regular classroom"; the latter is consonant with the direction the State has encouraged through its technical assistance and training activities. Most districts reported using more than one model.

The spring assessment asked districts to tell which program goals they considered to have been met. Following is a list of responses:

Program Goals Met: All

- Adaptation of regular materials
- Cooperative Learning
- LEP students mainstreamed
- Increased district financial involvement
- Continued training for district staff
- Make available ESL teacher
- Ensure each ESL student provided opportunity for equal education
- Bring LEP students to functional skill level
- Familiarize students with American culture
- Help LEP students learn about and maintain their own culture
- Provide first-language content instruction
- Began services at new site
- Identify students
- Determine needs
- Modify programs
- Increased self-confidence
- Improved cooperation with migrant program
- Better attendance

Program Assessment Data, Continued

Districts were also asked which program goals were not met:

- Bilingual training
- Bring students to level necessary to function in all-English classroom
- Bring students up to grade level
- Provide adequate ESL resources
- Provide enough aide or tutorial help
- Employ additional staff
- Provide first-language content instruction

Districts were asked what factors interfered with achieving these goals:

- Lack of personnel
- Need more time
- Lack of funds
- Parent apathy
- Drop-outs due to financial pressures
- Minimal ESL resource materials
- Numbers of students
- Lack of space for pull-out and small groups
- Pressure to go to work
- Early grade retention
- Lack of a total school program
- Lack of student desire to learn English
- Lack of teachers' knowledge about students' culture
- Parents' "fear" of school and system
- School placement
- Scheduling
- Lack of staff training in integrating reading and writing skills

Program Assessment Data, Continued

V. Staff Development And Training

Districts were asked to what degree persons involved in the LEP program were adequately trained to meet LEP students' needs. They were asked to assess the adequacy of training for aides/tutors, teachers, administrators, counselors and parents on a scale of 1 to 5 where 5 meant "adequate" and 1 meant "inadequate". On a statewide average, aides and tutors were perceived as being the most adequately trained staff, slightly higher than the perceived level of adequacy of teachers' training. The levels of perceived adequacy were very similar to the previous year's data, except for parent training, which was .3 points higher. This was the second year in a row that parent training was perceived to have improved. Although these results suggest a general satisfaction with adequacy of training, it should be remembered that these are means; therefore, a considerable number of districts reported lower levels of satisfaction.

Persons	Average Training Adequacy
Aides/Tutors	3.8
Teachers	3.5
Administrators	3.4
Counselors	3.0
Parents	3.0

The assessment form listed seven topics for possible training and asked respondents to check which ones were needed in their districts.

Topic	Number
Language Acquisition Theories	33
Language Assessment	37
ESL Materials	49
Methods of Teaching ESL	53
Cooperative Learning	32
Sheltered Mainstream	33
Peer Coaching	35
Other	5

These results are similar to the two previous years' in that ESL methods and materials were the most frequently named. The continuing perceived need for sheltered mainstream training no doubt reflects the State's on-going promotion of alternatives to pull-out through its technical assistance and training activities.

Program Assessment Data, Continued

Districts reported how many trainings had been held for aides/tutors, teachers, administrators, counselors and parents.

Aides/Tutors	149
Teachers	96
Administrators	83
Counselors	29
Parents	61
TOTAL	418

These figures represent 36 fewer total trainings than the previous year, despite the increased statewide response rate to the survey forms. The greatest drops were seen in teacher and parent training.

Appendix C

SUMMARY OF DATA REQUIRED BY TITLE VII

Enrollment and Identification

Total number of children in public schools: **214,571**

Total number of children in private schools: **5769**
(This figure is approximate; private schools are not required to report enrollment data.)

Total number of limited English proficient students: **3986**
(Based on spring self-assessment)

Methods used to identify LEP students

English Proficiency Test	Number	
Pre-LAS (Language Assessment Scales)	12	
Language Assessment Scales	38	
Dos Amigos	5	
Idea Proficiency Test	13	
Other		19

Standardized Achievement Test	Number
Iowa Test of Basic Skills	53
Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills	5
California Achievement Test	3
Other	25

Educational Condition of LEP students

The following table shows the median percentages reported for the number of LEP students determined to be below grade level during the 1990-91 school year in reading, math and writing and lacking listening and speaking skills in English.

Content	Grade Range K-3	4-6	7-8	9-12
Reading	72%	75%	75%	86%
Math	40%	46%	42%	28%
Writing	61%	67%	75%	75%
Listening and Speaking	61%	58%	67%	66%

Referred to or placed in special education programs: **249**

Retained in one or more grades: **Not reported**

Dropped out of school: **Not reported**

Services Provided to LEP Students

Number of LEP students currently enrolled in special programs to meet their language needs: **3550**

Following are the numbers of districts employing specified instructional models in their LEP programs:

Model	Number
Modified regular classroom	53
Peer tutoring	49
Teacher pullout	36
Summer school	33
Aide/tutor pullout	59
Other	9

Number of Title VII Part A program operated in Idaho in 1990-91: **1**

Number of LEP students served in special programs as of spring 1991: **3550**

Number of LEP students in need of, but not receiving, ESL and/or bilingual education services: **436**